





No 4265.422



**Boston Public Library**

th pen or



Desultory m2

12

---

# Slavery in Missouri.

---

4265.422

1856





# DESULTORY REMARKS

ON THE QUESTION OF EXTENDING

## SLAVERY INTO MISSOURI:

AS ENUNCIATED DURING THE FIRST SESSION OF THE SIXTEENTH CONGRESS, BY THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM CHESTER COUNTY, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

---

*— quaeque ipse miserrima vidi,  
Et quorum pars minima fui.*

---

4265.422

EXTRACTED FROM THE AMERICAN REPUBLICAN NEWSPAPER OF 1819-20.

WEST CHESTER, PA:

LEWIS MARSHALL, PRINTER.

1856.

From 7585.54

282,068

Aug. 26, 1880.



## PREFATORY.

THE pending struggle with the *Slave Power* of the South, in its unhallowed efforts to pollute our *Free Territory* with Human Bondage—a Territory which was once believed to be protected from that awful curse, under the deceptive “*Compromise*” of 1820—very naturally awakens the recollection of the unhappy controversy, known to the past generation as the “*Missouri Question*.”

At that time, CHESTER COUNTY—as far as appeared—was united, and proudly *unanimous*, in resisting the aggressions of the *Slave Power*. No man, of any Sect or Party, within her limits, ventured then to betray a symptom of truckling to that insatiate and inexorable Power. The same was almost literally true of our good old Commonwealth. But *now*, there is too much reason to apprehend, that a portion of our people has become sadly degenerate, and servile, on that momentous question. It cannot fail, however, to be highly gratifying to every friend of Freedom, and Fair Play, to witness the manly stand taken by the *present Representative* of our venerable Bailiwick, in this second and more desperate assault upon Human Rights and National Prosperity. His position will unquestionably prove a source of enduring, satisfactory reflection, to himself,—and will, no doubt, be remembered to his honor, when the paltry squabbles of the factions and *cliques* of our day shall be utterly forgotten, or reviewed, with a blush, through the misty veil of tradition.

Under an impression that it might, peradventure, afford a passing interest to some of our younger contemporaries, to reproduce the sentiments and opinions of a by-gone age, as uttered by a former member from this District, during the agitation of the *Missouri Question*.—the same are here collected and presented, merely with the addition of a few occasional notes. Whatever may be the present estimate of the notions then honestly held—though hastily and crudely expressed,—the author is free to say, that in reviewing them, after a lapse of thirty-six years, he finds no doctrine but what he now conscientiously holds — no sentiments to disavow—no opinions to retract,—nothing, in short, to regret, save his own inadequate powers, and the unpropitious result of the memorable contest then waged for Philanthropy and Free Institutions. If those views of a former Representative, shall still be found in accordance with the sentiments of the People among whom he has passed his three score years and ten, he will find consolation in the hope that his youthful dream of a pure Republic, and the equal Rights of Man, has not altogether become an “obsolete idea.”

*West Chester, Penn., March 25, 1856.*

## SLAVERY IN MISSOURI.

At a meeting of the citizens of CHESTER COUNTY, (a) held agreeably to public notice, at the Court House, in the Borough of West Chester, on Saturday, the 27th of November, 1819, EDWARD DARLINGTON, Esq., Chairman, and ISAAC D. BARNARD, Secretary, the following Resolutions were adopted, viz:—

Whereas, it is at all times the right of the citizens peaceably to assemble and express their opinions on public affairs, and it becomes their duty so to do when matters of great interest to the country and to the present and future generations agitate the Councils of the Nation;—such we consider the question of admitting new States into the Union, without providing against the introduction of Slavery therein;—therefore

*Resolved*, as the opinion of this meeting, that it would be unwise, impolitic, and unjust, for Congress to admit the proposed State of Missouri, or any other new State, into the Union, unless such State shall sufficiently provide by their Constitution and frame of government against the introduction of Slavery into the same.

*Resolved*, that a circular Letter, expressive of the sense of this

---

(a) One of the arts by which the Slave Power, at the present day, manages Northern Politicians, is to make them believe the extension of Slavery is a strictly *Party* question—a question in which the “*Democracy*” (save the mark!) is vitally interested; and the game is—whenever the “*peculiar institution*” requires it—to sound the alarm, as thus:—“*Beware of Federalists and Fanatics!*” “*Stick to the Party!*” This silly slang influences thousands of Northern dolts, who cannot—or will not—see that whenever the question arises, the *South* cares for no *Party* ties. They may differ about other things; but on the one *peculiar* topic, they permit neither opponents, nor neutrals, among them. *Every Party, there*—no matter what its character, creed, or pretensions—(even, alas! to the *Judiciary*)—*invariably goes in solid phalanx for Slavery!* But *here*—in 1819—no man ventured to charge the proceedings at *West Chester*,—or the Resolutions of the *State Authorities*—with being *Party* movements. It would have been *rare news* to the people of *Chester County*, in those days, to have announced EDWARD DARLINGTON, and Major BARNARD, as either *Federalists*, or *Fanatics*. The original *Democracy* had not, *then*, fallen into the keeping and guidance of *old Federal Leaders*; but were ever ready to vindicate *Human Rights*, and resist sinister Projects, without regard to idle *Party* watchwords, from tainted sources.



meeting, be signed by the Chairman and Secretary, and addressed to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania, in the Congress of the United States.

A Committee, consisting of the following gentlemen, viz.: *Wm. H. Dillingham*, *Dr. Charles Lukens*, and *George Massey*, being appointed to prepare the Circular, agreeably to the last above Resolution, the meeting adjourned for a short time.

Being again assembled, a Letter was reported, and approved of. It was then

*Resolved*, that the different Counties of this State be requested to hold similar meetings with the present, in order to obtain a distinct and general expression of the public sentiment.

*Resolved*, that a Committee, consisting of five persons, be appointed to correspond with other Committees; to forward the Letters agreed upon to our members in Congress, and to hold such other Correspondence on the subject as they may think will promote the objects of the meeting.

The following gentlemen were appointed the said Committee of Correspondence, viz.: *Jesse Kersey*, *John Duer*, *Charles Mowry*, *Wm. Jackson, Jr.*, *Isaiah Kirk*. And it was further *Resolved*, that these proceedings be published.

(Signed,) EDWARD DARLINGTON, Chairman.

I. D. BARNARD, Secretary.

[See *American Republican*, December 7, 1819.]

The "free soil" sentiments of CHESTER COUNTY, as thus expressed, were promptly sustained by the *unanimous* voice of the *State Authorities*, in the following Proceedings,—worthy of *Pennsylvania* in her best days.

*RESOLUTIONS relative to preventing the introduction of Slavery into new States.*

The Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, whilst they cherish the right of the individual States to express their opinions upon all public measures proposed in the Congress of the Union, are aware that its usefulness must in a great degree depend upon the discretion with which it is exercised. They believe that the right ought not to be resorted to upon trivial subjects or unimportant occasions, but they are also persuaded that there are moments when the neglect to exercise it would be a dereliction of public duty.



Such an occasion as in their judgment demands the frank expression of the sentiments of Pennsylvania, is now presented. A measure was ardently supported in the last Congress of the United States, and will probably be as earnestly urged during the existing session of that body, which has a palpable tendency to impair the political relations of the several States; which is calculated to mar the social happiness of the present, and future generations; which, if adopted, would impede the march of Humanity and Freedom through the world, and would affix and perpetuate an odious stain upon the present race: a measure, in brief, which proposes to spread the crimes and cruelties of Slavery, from the banks of the Mississippi to the shores of the Pacific.

When measures of this character are seriously advocated in the Republican Congress of America in the Nineteenth Century, the several States are invoked by the duty which they owe to the Deity, by the veneration which they entertain for the memory of the Founders of the Republic, and by a tender regard for Posterity, to protest against its adoption, to refuse to covenant with crime, and to limit the range of an evil that already hangs in awful boding over so large a portion of the Union.

Nor can such a Protest be entered by any State with greater propriety than by Pennsylvania. This Commonwealth has as sacredly respected the rights of other States, as it has been careful of its own. It has been the invariable aim of the people of Pennsylvania to extend to the Universe, by their example, the unadulterated blessings of civil and religious Freedom. It is their pride, that they have been at all times the practical advocates of those improvements and charities amongst men, which are so well calculated to enable them to answer the purposes of their Creator; and, above all, they may boast that they were foremost in removing the pollution of Slavery from amongst them. If, indeed, the measure against which Pennsylvania considers it her duty to raise her voice, was calculated to abridge any of the rights guaranteed to the several States; if, odious as Slavery is, it was proposed to hasten its extinction by means injurious to the States upon which it was unhappily entailed, —Pennsylvania would be among the first to insist upon a sacred observance of the Constitutional compact. But it cannot be pretended that the rights of any of the States are at all affected by refusing to extend the mischiefs of Human Bondage over the boundless regions of the West,—a Territory which formed no part of the

Confederation at the adoption of the Constitution; which has been but lately purchased from an European Power by the people of the Union at large; which may or may not be admitted as a State into the Union at the discretion of Congress, which must establish a Republican form of Government, and no other; and whose climate affords none of the pretexts urged for resorting to the labor of the natives of the torrid zone. Such a Territory has no right, inherent or acquired, such as those States possessed which established the existing Constitution. When that Constitution was framed, in September, seventeen hundred and eighty-seven, the concession that three-fifths of the Slaves in the States then existing should be represented in Congress, could not have been intended to embrace regions at that time held by a foreign power. On the contrary, so anxious were the Congress of that day to confine Human Bondage within its ancient home, that, on the thirteenth of July, seventeen hundred and eighty-seven, that body unanimously declared that Slavery or involuntary servitude should not exist in the extensive Territories bounded by the Ohio, the Mississippi, Canada, and the Lakes. And in the ninth section of the first article of the Constitution itself, the power of Congress to prohibit the migration of servile persons after the year eighteen hundred and eight, is expressly recognized; nor is there to be found in the Statute book a single instance of the admission of a Territory to the rank of a State, in which Congress have not adhered to the right vested in them by the Constitution, to stipulate with the Territory upon the conditions of such admission.

The Senate and House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, therefore, cannot but deprecate any departure from the humane and enlightened policy, pursued not only by the illustrious Congress of 1787, but by their successors, without exception. They are persuaded that, to open the fertile regions of the West to a servile race, would tend to increase their numbers beyond all past example, would open a new and steady market for the lawless venders of human flesh, and would render all schemes for obliterating this most foul blot upon the American character, useless and unavailing.

Under these convictions, and in the full persuasion that upon this topic there is but one opinion in Pennsylvania—

*Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, That the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States, be and*

they are hereby requested, to vote against the admission of any Territory as a State into the Union, unless "the further introduction of Slavery or involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall be prohibited; and all children born within the said Territory, after its admission into the Union as a State, shall be free, but may be held to service until the age of twenty-five years."

*Resolved*, That the Governor be and he is hereby requested, to cause a copy of the foregoing preamble and resolutions to be transmitted to each of the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States.

JOSEPH LAWRENCE,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

ISAAC WEAVER,

*Speaker of the Senate.*

APPROVED, the twenty-second day of December, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen.

WILLIAM FINDLAY.

---

[From the American Republican, December 28, 1819.]

MR. MOWRY:—I have seen some editorial remarks in the *National Intelligencer* of the 20th inst., in reply to an essay, from a Rhode Island paper, on the subject of *Slavery*, which in my opinion deserve a few comments. The editors unite with the writer of that essay, in expressing their abhorrence of the *slave trade*; and yet are willing that our free government should sanction the *extension* of that traffic into new regions, where the soil has never yet been sullied by the footstep of a *slave*! By *slave trade*—it is true—those editors mean the transportation of persons from their native country to another country, and selling them for slaves; but I consider—and I think every disinterested man will also consider—the propagation of Slavery in new territories, where it never existed before, as a *trade* equally abhorrent,—and equally unworthy of a people professing the principles of liberty. Is it more criminal to kidnap the inhabitants of Africa, and sell them to those who will buy them, than it is to organize new territories in such a way as will inevitably entail Slavery upon unborn millions of the human race? What have the *unborn* descendants of Africa done, which makes it less criminal to predetermine their bondage, than it is to consign those



already born to Slavery? Will not the extension of Slavery into the boundless regions of the West, tend to multiply that description of persons more rapidly among us, than all the slave ships that ever traded to our shores? Most indubitably it will. And therefore I consider the proposition as the most stupendous attempt to promote a *real, and interminable slave trade*, that was ever yet devised by the cupidity of man. The multiplication of the human species is notoriously accelerated by distributing them over a large surface of fertile territory. It has done more to increase the population of the United States, than could have been effected by all the fleets of Europe. The addition to our numbers made by immigrants, is but as a drop in a bucket compared to the increase by procreation, which is promoted by the distribution of our people, and the consequent facilities in obtaining subsistence; and the same principles apply equally to a *black*, as to a white population. Is not the proposition then—I repeat—the most gigantic plan for driving on a *real slave trade* that ever was conceived? The obvious sneer at the Rhode Islanders, which the editors of the *Intelligencer* have indulged in, on account of those people having been formerly concerned as carriers of slaves, is very little to the purpose. The fact only shows, that whenever there is a market for an iniquitous traffic—no matter how abhorrent to the virtuous part of the community—there will always be persons whose avarice will prompt them to take advantage of it. Yet, with this humiliating fact before their eyes, the editors are anxious to open a boundless market, offering irresistible temptations to *such traders*, within the bosom of our own country! They wish to open a field—and consequently to create a demand—for that pestiferous population, which will at once double the value of every negro in the United States, and cause every breeding female slave to be considered as a prolific source of wealth to her owner. If *this* would not be to encourage a *slave trade*, and to establish it beyond all control, I confess I know nothing of the matter.

There is another topic touched upon, in the editorial remarks in the *Intelligencer*, which I cannot agree to let pass unnoticed. They have artfully endeavored to couple the opposition to the extension of slavery with the noted *Hartford Convention*, of detestable memory. This attempt to blend the machinations of *Treason* with a manly opposition to the *growth of slavery*, is an imputation against the Republicans of the Middle and Northern States, as ungenerous

as it is unfounded in truth or justice. Sir, I detest the *Hartford Convention*, and all who were aiding or abetting therein, or approving thereof, as much as I do the diffusion of *human slavery*, and the vocation of *slave traders*,—and for pretty much the same reasons. I detest them *all*, because I consider them inimical to Republican Freedom;—hostile in their nature to equal rights, and destructive of human happiness. Are *Pennsylvania*, *New Jersey*, and *New York*, to be taunted and told of the *Hartford Convention*, because they are opposed to the growth and expansion of *slavery*? Let those States which have done their duty to the Union *better than these*, step forth and show the grounds for the imputation. Let us see whether “*faithful Pennsylvania*” has not been as efficient a supporter of the Union, against the treasonable machinations of the *Hartford Convention*, and its co-adjutors, as any other State which the editors of the *National Intelligencer* may please to name. I hope, sir, we shall see no more such attempts to attach odium to the stand which the Republicans of the Middle and Northern States have felt it their duty to take, against the extension of the direst Curse which hangs over our Nation. We love and cherish our Union,—we love our Republican fellow citizens, East, West, North, and South,—we love our country, and its Free Institutions, better than we love our lives;—and it is *because* of this love, that we raise our voices against the *further extension* of that deadliest foe to our country’s happiness—*human slavery*.

A PENNSYLVANIA DEMOCRAT.

December 27, 1819.

[From the American Republican, Jan. 11, 1820.]

MR. MOWRY:—In the *Democratic Press* of the 22d ult., there is a communication signed “T. C.” (a) on the subject of *Human Slavery*,—which in its doctrines and logic, is every way worthy of the days of *James the First*, or his immaculate son *Charles*—who, in their time, were the *anointed*, “legitimate, *jure divino* masters, and owners of the populace of Great Britain. How Mr. *Binns* could, in this great Commonwealth, and at this time of day, suffer *such an* article to pass through his press to the public, without some Editorial protest, or accompanying antidote to the poison, is for *him* to ex-

---

(a) No doubt the initials of *Thomas Cooper*,—a *quondam* Judge, in *Pennsylvania*; and then a Professor in *South Carolina*.

plain, and not me. All that I have to notice, is the infamous article itself; and I shall do it in my own blunt, free-spoken, American manner,—although I am well aware that the writer of that essay is a learned native of “His Majesty’s” dominions, and was regularly educated, and brought up, in the full enjoyment of the blessings of “legitimacy.” “T. C.,” if I mistake not his *signature*, came to Pennsylvania under the character of an English Whig, and friend to the Rights of Man; but time has shown, that like most other disciples of *English Whigism*, his principles are of a very convenient, accommodating quality. Having lately received an appointment in a Slave-holding State, he undertakes to ingratiate himself with his new patrons, by coming out boldly as the champion of Slavery. No *American* ever yet dared to vindicate Human Slavery in the abstract,—or to justify the bondage of his fellow men upon any other plea than that of *necessity*. But “T. C.” outstrips the most ardent of our indigenous enemies of *restriction*, and completely out-Herods Herod in his dogmas on the Slavery of his species. The planters of the South, being the sons and descendants of those patriots who declared that “*all men were created equal*,—that they were endowed with certain inalienable rights—among which were life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness,” &c. I say, these gentlemen never dreamt of *justifying* Slavery,—except on the above-mentioned plea; and I suspect they will think that Mr. “T. C.’s” essay—if it prove any thing—proves *rather too much* for this Republican climate. “T. C.” has most audaciously undertaken to *prove*, in this land of liberty, that *human slavery* is “defensible by the *law of nature*”—“by the *law of God*”—and “by the municipal laws of the great majority of civilized nations, ancient and modern,”—as if the detestable codes of tyranny, in the old world, were therefore to be binding on *us*! He also attempts to *prove* that “negroes have no *right* to object to negro Slavery”—that “Congress has not the *right* to prohibit Slavery “in our Territories,”—and that “under present circumstances, it is not *expedient* to prohibit it!” Here is, indeed, a precious string of propositions, to be *proved* in the face of a youthful Nation of Freemen, who have just had an ornamented copy of their Declaration of Independence published, as a renewed evidence of their zeal for the doctrine that “all men are created free and equal!” If the laws of nature, and nature’s God, and the laws of *civilized* nations, all concur in justifying and authorizing



*slavery*, I should like to know by what *right* the patriots of seventy-six resisted the "civilized" enactments of his Majesty George the Third, "by the grace of God" King of these Colonies? What right have the "radical" Slaves at Manchester, &c., in England, who talk about "reform"—what *right*, I say, have they to "object" to their Slavery? "T. C." says, "*negroes* have no *right* to object to Slavery," *because* "throughout *Africa* they make Slaves of each other; and where the Slaves cannot be *sold* as Slaves, they are kept as Slaves. It has been so from time immemorial, and is so now. I refer to the travellers in *Africa* on this point, particularly to *Park*." Now if *this* be sound logic, I say in my turn, that *Englishmen* have no *right* to object to *oppression*. Throughout *Great Britain* they oppress, and tyrannize over, *each other*; and where their wretched vassals cannot be controlled as such, they are either hung or transported as convicts. It has been so from time immemorial, *and is so now*. It is the undisputed and indisputable condition of the British nation. I refer to all the histories of England on this point,—and particularly to *Walsh's Appeal*. In short, sir, I am utterly disgusted and nauseated with the *principles* displayed in this detestable essay:—to call them *arguments*, would be to insult the understandings of American Republicans, and to calumniate the departed spirits of our fathers. If *such* are the real doctrines and sentiments of all those *English Whigs*, who come here to illuminate us benighted Yankees with their "legitimate" logic, I pray God that we may speedily have such a revision of the *Tariff* as will effectually prohibit their further importation,—and that the exclusive privilege of manufacturing Whigs, for *home-use*, may be secured to our own country! But I do *not* believe that such are the prevailing sentiments of those who seek an asylum amongst us. I firmly believe that the doctrines of "T. C." are as profligate a libel upon the great majority of those lovers of Liberty who seek our shores, as they are upon the principles of the American Government, and the dictates of justice and common sense.

A PENNSYLVANIAN.

January 3, 1820.

From the American Republican, January 18, 1820.

I observe that a writer in your paper of the 28th ult., has animadverted, with some warmth, on the coupling of the *Hartford Convention people* with those who are opposed to the further extension of *slavery*. I consider his remarks altogether just, in point of principle; and I can help him to a fact, which may serve to fortify his positions. There is but *one* member of the Hartford Convention now in Congress, (and that, in my opinion, is one too many,) viz.: *H. G. Otis*, of the Senate. By the Senate Journal of last session, pages 321-2, it may be seen that Mr. Otis was opposed to all sort of restriction upon Slavery in Missouri,—and that he recorded his name with those of all the Senators from the Slaveholding States on that question! So much for the Hartford Convention spectre, which has been conjured up to deter Republicans from opposing the extension of Slavery!

January 12, 1820.

---

From the American Republican, January 25, 1820.

WASHINGTON CITY, January 19, 1820.

The attention of all persons here, for the last few days, has been almost exclusively directed toward the Senate Chamber,—on account of the discussion which is there going on, relative to the restriction of Slavery in Missouri. The Representatives desert their seats by scores, to listen to the debates in the Senate; and there will probably be no business of general importance transacted in the House, until the Senate shall have disposed of that question.

The interest which it excites is almost inconceivable by persons at a distance. The galleries are literally crowded, and the lobby thronged with *privileged* characters,—who, by the rules of the Senate, are admitted within the chamber. Among these, the Vice President has, with great gallantry, reckoned the ladies; in consequence of which, the audience is of the most flattering description to those who are fond of displaying their eloquence in the presence of the fair. One reason for this general attendance has been the expectation of hearing a great speech from Mr. *Pinkney* in favor of Slavery; (a) but he has not yet taken the floor. The anxiety of the Slaveholders to hear what Mr. Pinkney will say, is extraordinary; and it was amusing enough to witness their impatience and vexation

---

(a) Mr. P. had been an able champion of *Freedom* in his younger and better days.

during the long, forcible, and ingenious speeches of Messrs. Roberts and Morrill, against the further extension of that heinous evil. They were waiting to hear the congenial notes of a fluent advocate of their doctrine; and, lest they might be absent when he rose, had to listen, in the meantime, to the manly tones of those who vindicate the true principles of Republican Freedom. To judge from the apparent impression, these tones must have been about as grateful to their ears, as the whetting of a mill-saw. It was, indeed, a pretty severe tax upon the anticipated pleasure; and Mr. Randolph observed to those around him, that it was something like taking a dose of physic for the sake of getting some sweat-meats afterwards! A gentleman who stood near, remarked, that from the wry faces they made, it did seem to be a rather unpalatable dose; but he hoped, now they had got it down, it might operate, and have a salutary effect! It is a melancholy and mortifying spectacle, to see the Congress of this youthful Republic in grave debate, whether they will authorize Human Slavery throughout the numerous Commonwealths which are hereafter to be attached to the Confederacy. The virtuous bosoms of our distant posterity—when the evils of Slavery shall have become more awfully menacing—will throb with shame and anguish, when they turn to the pages of our history, and read, that in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty, and within half a century from the Declaration of Independence, the Republican Congress of the United States were engaged in an ardent discussion on the *propriety* of permitting the Slavery of their species to be extended over all the fair domains of their infant settlements,—and that it was a long time extremely doubtful, whether they would not sanction the erection of numerous sovereignties, in which man should be authorized to hold his fellow man as property. (a) This they will have to read—even if restriction should be imposed. But if, unfortunately, the evil should be suffered to ramify and diffuse itself, like a malignant cancer, throughout the body politic, our descendants must not only turn over the pages of *our* history with bitter regret,—but they will, too probably, find the annals of *their own times* bedewed with tears of ago-

---

(a) That *doubt* has since been solved, with a witness. The Gordian knot was not cut with less hesitancy by “Macedonia’s madman,” than has been displayed by the reckless *Slave Power*, on that awful question; and the hapless posterity of that power, most likely, will one day have cause both to blush for their ancestors, and tremble for themselves.



nizing woe, and traced in the most frightful characters of blood. No reflecting man can cast his eyes through the vista of future ages and calculate the consequences of a *servile population*—diffused throughout the Republic, and accumulated to desperate millions—without the most awful apprehensions. No man, who loves his offspring, but must fervently pray to Heaven, that ere that day arrives, his posterity may all become extinct.

---

WASHINGTON CITY, January 26, 1820.

The Senate have been engaged in the debate on the *Missouri* question for a week or more,—and probably will be for a week to come. Mr. *Pinkney* has made his long expected speech, to an audience crowded almost to suffocation. It was able, ingenious, and forcibly delivered—as his manner is; but I have no doubt he could have made a much better one, in every respect, if it had suited to take the *other side* of the question. The House of Representatives yesterday commenced the discussion of the same subject, and in all probability it will occupy their attention until the latter end of February. What *other* consequences may grow out of the debate, I know not; but I am strongly inclined to the opinion, that conviction, or a change of sentiment, will not be among the number of its effects upon the audience.

---

WASHINGTON CITY, February 2d, 1820.

Yesterday the question was taken, in the Senate, on Mr. *Roberts'* motion to restrict Slavery in *Missouri*; and was decided in the *negative*, by a majority (*yeas* 16, *nays* 27) which the friends of human rights could not have anticipated, at this early period of our Republic. Mr. *Otis*, of *Massachusetts*, as you will perceive by the *yeas* and *nays*, has from some cause changed his ground, since last year; but the other four New England States were divided, and their votes neutralized.(a) Both the Senators from *Illinois*, also voted against restriction—contrary to the known wishes of their

---

(a) It is a remarkable and significant fact,—that on this vital subject of *slavery*—its *extension* and *protection*,—the *North* is continually *divided*, and its influence *neutralized*,—while in every instance where the question is presented, the *South* is an *unit*. No Representative of the *Slave Power*,—let his private opinion be what it may,—ever dares to say a word in opposition to that power. The *North* has many cliques and parties, and fritters away its strength until it becomes an easy prey to its wily adversary; but the *South*, with all its pretensions to political principles, knows no party but its despotic master, the *Slave Power*.

constituents. Thus, you see, the virtuous principles of 1787, which were then exerted, *with effect*, to stay the spreading of that foul blot upon our national escutcheon, have suffered a lamentable depreciation in the short space of thirty three years. I used to hear, and read, as the sentiments of *Slaveholders*, that Slavery was a curse which they were anxious to remove, and control, by every possible means,—that it was an evil brought on them contrary to their wishes—an outrage upon the rights of humanity, which they abhorred, and deplored, and were solicitous to remedy as fast as possible, in conformity with the spirit of our Declaration of Independence. I may also add, that I used to *believe* these generous and plausible professions; and entertained a confidence that every opportunity would be embraced, with alacrity, to put them in practice. I can now say, however, that I am something older, and something *wiser*, than I then was; but my age and my wisdom are making sad inroads upon the *good opinion* which I once fondly cherished of those who held this specious language. I have lived to discover that the pretended aversion to slavery is all a *sham*; that the Slaveholders, generally, have not the least intention, or desire, to relinquish the luxurious gratifications which grow out of a despotic power over their sable fellow creatures. If it be a curse—as they were wont to term it,—it is one to which they cling with the fondest tenacity. I have lived to hear slavery—not only praised as a *comfortable condition*, but—vindicated by quotations from the Holy Scriptures! And further to show that our Republic is in a hopeful way, I have heard our *Declaration of Independence* burlesqued, and ridiculed, as holding absurd doctrine, in the Congress of these United States! Indeed I begin to think, myself, if the House of Representatives should give such a vote as the Senate, that the proceedings of 1776 *will* present a rather ridiculous and absurd phraseology. A regard for consistency, and common sense, will require that a *revision* should be had of that fanciful Document, which we are in the habit of reading on the 4th of July. The fact is, slavery has so many charms for those who are eductaed in all the indulgencies which it affords, that it is perfectly idle for *them* to talk about the evils of involuntary servitude. It is a sort of *evil* which they are very willing to endure, as yet: and the probability is, that as wealth, and luxury, and avarice increase, the fondness for owning *Slaves* will increase

in even a greater ratio. (a) It is consistent with the character of human nature that it should do so. And we may reasonably calculate upon the arrival of the day, when the obsolete chimeras of our Revolutionary Patriots will be ranked with the whims of astrologers and soothsayers. These observations are predicated upon the supposition that Slavery shall be permitted to extend over the Territories of the United States. But there is some reason to hope that the *Representatives of the People* will yet arrest the progress of this dark tide of pollution, and prevent it from rolling its noxious waves over the fair domains of the Republic. It is impossible, however, to say what influence the example of the Senate may have upon members of the House;—especially when it is nearly equally divided.

---

WASHINGTON CITY, February 9, 1820.

The attention of the House of Representatives is so exclusively devoted to the question of restricting Slavery, that there has been no variety in the proceedings since my last. Nothing else is done, or can be done, until this subject is disposed of. \* \* \* \* \* There are certainly a considerable number who yet intend to speak. The first two days were spent in skirmishing; and then the regular onset was made by Mr. Taylor's motion [to restrict Slavery]. Those who have already spoken are Messrs. Taylor, Clagett, Dowse, Cook and Hemphill, in favor of restriction; and Messrs. Holmes, A. Smyth, Reid, Randolph, Hardin, McLane, and Clay against it. Mr. Sergeant takes the floor to-day in support of the restriction,—and I presume will make an able speech. Although Mr. Hemphill had been so many years out of the practice of public speaking—and his health latterly very delicate—he gave a most ingenious and satisfactory exposition of the Constitution, and its bearing on this subject. The friends of restriction were much gratified with it; and his manner was so mild, that his opponents could take no offence at

---

(a) A distinguished Slave-holder took occasion, in debate, to remark on the evils of the “peculiar institution,” by saying that “it was no doubt a bad thing for the *slave*—but a very good thing for the *master*!” This is one of the wretched hallucinations of the system; something like the infatuation of the *opium-eater*,—fascinating for a time, but enervating, debasing, and destructive in the end. Independently of the cruel injustice to the *slave*, the most hateful feature of the enormity is its deteriorating action upon the *master*,—forcing him and his posterity—and all whites located within its pestilent influence—into a condition of lazy, labor-despising, worthless inefficiency.



his speech. Indeed, the speaking on both sides has been very able and ingenious; and, thus far, quite temperate. Mr. Holmes was somewhat sarcastic, and illiberal in his insinuations; but he got his change, in full, from Mr. Cook, a young member from Illinois. Yesterday Mr. Clay made a speech of near four hours, in his best manner. It was a fine display of eloquence,—although his arguments only suited half his audience. There is considerable talk of *Compromise*, out of doors; but how it will result no one can yet form any opinion. There will probably, in the first place, be a fair trial of strength; and then, no doubt, much generalship will be used, to reconcile the jarring interests of the contending parties, so as to prevent either side from seeming to yield the point. It will be well for the nation, if this question can be put to rest, without tarnishing its reputation as a liberty-loving and Republican people. Be that as it may, I have no doubt Pennsylvania will sustain her usual consistency of character. She will always be found among the faithful.

---

WASHINGTON CITY, February 16, 1820.

The great Missouri question, on which our national councils are embarked, is still afloat in the ocean of uncertainty,—and no one can yet see when or where it is to land. It is buffeted to and fro, by the tempest of debate,—sometimes close-hauled on the restrictive tack, hugging the fresh breezes of argument, and stemming the currents of error,—and sometimes bearing away large before the boisterous squalls of declamation—or drifting into danger, on the gulf streams of prejudice and infatuation. If an observation is not soon had, to ascertain the latitude and longitude, I think the crew will be at a loss to know where they are; though I apprehend they may safely venture to insert in the log-book, that they are not exactly in the Pacific ocean! But to disembark from this allegory: There is nothing doing in either House, but debating on this painful and degrading question. I call it degrading, because I think it unworthy of the character of this Nation, to sustain a question of establishing Slavery in the new Republics which are to be added to this Confederacy. The friends of Mankind and of Free Government, in all parts of the world, had expected better things of this people.

On Wednesday and Thursday last, Mr. Sergeant made one of the most splendidly argumentative speeches in favor of restriction,

which I ever heard. He out-did himself; and astonished even the most sanguine of his friends. \* \* \* \* \* If Slavery must overwhelm the boundless Territories of this last asylum of oppressed Humanity,—the friends of Freedom can at least console themselves with the reflection, that they have fairly entered their solemn and unanswerable protest against it. They have washed their hands of the dreadful enormity; and they have only to await with patience, and with approving consciences, the ulterior dispensations of a just and over-ruling Providence.

Those who have spoken since Mr. Sergeant, are Messrs. Barbour, Anderson, Pindall, Pinckney, Rankin, and Cuthbert, against restriction; and Messrs. Gross, N. Y., Cushman, Wood, and Hendricks in favor of it. Mr. Johnson, of Virginia, is entitled to the floor to-day; and many more are waiting for an opportunity to express their sentiments. The subject will at least be as fully discussed as any that ever was before Congress; and it is to be fervently hoped that it may ultimately be disposed of in a manner that may not tarnish the high reputation of our young and beloved Republic.

---

### DEBATE ON THE MISSOURI BILL.

On the 16th of February, 1820, the member from CHESTER COUNTY, Penna., addressed the Chair as follows:—

MR. CHAIRMAN:—I wish to submit a few remarks on this question; and I trust the Committee will be disposed to extend their indulgence toward me for a few moments, when they recollect that I am not in the habit of tresspassing on their patience in this way. I am very sensible that I shall not be able to do justice even to my own views of the subject; for I am utterly unpracticed in the business of public speaking; yet, believing that this is a question of vital importance—not only to the character of this nation, but likewise to its safety, prosperity, and happiness,—and believing also that some erroneous impressions exist, in relation to many of those who advocate the amendment before you,—I feel constrained to attempt a few observations.

I shall not presume to undertake an exposition of ambiguous Constitutional points, after the very able and learned discussions which we have had from gentlemen who have preceded me. Such an attempt would, in my opinion, be as unnecessary now, as it certainly would be presumptuous in me at any time. I shall therefore content myself, at this stage of the debate, with offering some of those views

which present themselves to a common understanding. And here, sir, as an American—proud and jealous of our national character—I trust I may be permitted to say, that it is a source of no little mortification to me to see the Congress of these United States, in the 44th year of our Independence, seriously sustaining the question, *whether it be rightful and expedient, without an uncontrollable necessity, to sanction Human Slavery in the new Republics which are to be added to this Confederacy?* I had once fondly hoped that such a spectacle would never have been exhibited by us, to gratify the malignant despots, and their execrable parasites, who outrage the rights of mankind in the old world, and who sicken at the idea of their conservation here. I had hoped, that we should have persevered in erecting new Republics upon the true and genuine principles of our Government,—excluding Human Slavery with the utmost care and solicitude, wherever it should be in our power to do so. The generous and predominant sentiments of the American people—as far as I have had an opportunity to be acquainted with those sentiments—seemed to me to warrant such a hope, and I cannot yet relinquish the idea.

We have been told, indeed—and I feel it my duty, as a Representative of *Republican Pennsylvania*, to notice the remark,—we have been told, Mr. Chairman, that however laudable may be the motives of many who are in favor of restricting Slavery, yet there are *political jugglers* behind the scenes, who are making use of the proposition and its advocates, as the forlorn hope, and the last desperate effort of an *expiring Party*. Sir, where I am best known, it would be needless to say that *I* have nothing to do with their views, their efforts or their hopes,—that I have never had any concern or connection with that “*expiring Party*.” From my earliest youth, upwards, I have been a Democratic Republican; and I leave it to those who have once belonged to the aforesaid *expiring Party*—if there be any such here—(a) to develop the schemes of their jugglers. I have never been in their secrets: but I cannot help observing, that I see gentlemen who are avowed members of that unfortunate Party, zealously engaged in the ranks of our opponents, in endeavors to defeat this amendment. I do not believe it is a question of *Party* views, with any man who loves his Country, or feels an interest in its reputation and permanent welfare. But, Sir, I have always been

---

(a) Mr. *Holmes*, of Maine, made the allusion to the “*expiring Party*,”—and he once belonged to that Party!



taught to believe that it was no part of *Republicanism* to authorize, or even to connive at *Slavery*, in the formation of governments, where it could possibly be prevented. I will here frankly confess, too, that it is cause of pain and regret to be opposed to gentlemen for whom I have the highest regard, and with whom it has generally been the pride and the happiness of myself and my colleagues to co-operate. But on this occasion, I must pursue a course—however opposite to that of my Southern friends—which a solemn sense of duty renders imperative: and I ask gentlemen to exercise their accustomed liberality toward us. If they think it strange that we who have generally acted with them, are opposed to *them* on this subject, we can only say, that we think it equally strange, and we do most sincerely regret, to find them in opposition to *us*.

What is it, Mr. Chairman, which this amendment proposes,—and which seems to excite such an uncommon degree of sympathy for Missouri? What is the mighty bugbear that so alarms gentlemen? Is it proposed to bind her hand and foot, and deliver her over to the dominion of Despotism? Sir, a man of plain comprehension might well be astonished if he were to learn, for the first time, after hearing the arguments and forcible appeals of gentlemen, that the simple proposition before you, is to enable Missouri to become an independent Republican State, and to *secure her from the dreadful curse of Slavery!* We propose to do that for her which we have already done for the States north-west of the Ohio,—and for which the citizens of those States will be forever grateful.

Mr. Chairman, the existence of Slavery seems to be universally considered a great moral and political evil in the community. Honorable gentlemen who have an intimate knowledge of its nature and tendencies, have emphatically termed it a curse and a scourge to Society. The ancient and respectable Commonwealth of *Virginia* perceived, at an early day, the evils which it would entail upon her,—and she protested against the further increase of it. But the Government of Great Britain—regardless of the welfare of her Colonies—permitted the temporary interest of a few to endanger the prosperity, the happiness, and the safety, of the countless generations who were to succeed them. We know that this tremendous evil was fastened upon our country by the mercenary, heartless policy of an arbitrary commercial Government—not only without our agency and consent, but—against our earnest protestations. But I beg to ask, Sir,—what is it *we* are about to do? I wish every

member of the Committee would seriously consider *this* Question:—*What is it WE are about to do?* Sir, unless this amendment prevail,—WE, the Republican Congress of the United States, are about to permit the temporary interest of a few individuals (for *few* they are, compared with the numbers who are hereafter to exist there) to entail this same transcendent Curse upon the unborn myriads of our Posterity, who will, in future times, inhabit the fertile regions of the West!

Yes, Sir: *as we now view* the conduct of *Great Britain* in imposing or authorizing Slavery in some of our ancient Commonwealths, *so will the future citizens* of those Western Republics *regard this Congress*,—unless we interpose to stay the progress of the desolating evil. If we suffer this pernicious population to ramify and diffuse itself throughout the new States to be formed in our Territories, their citizens will one day direct their agonized views to the proceedings of this body, and deplore the policy which sanctioned their dreadful destiny. They will find themselves doomed to evils, by our connivance and authority, which it will be vain and hopeless to attempt to remove.

Will any gentleman of *Virginia*, or *Maryland*, say that it would not have been a happy circumstance for their own States, if the early settlers had been prevented from introducing *Slaves* among them? And will it not be equally beneficial to exclude them from the Western Commonwealths? Can there be a doubt about this? No, Sir—there cannot. Then *now* is the time to interfere; and it is NOW, OR NEVER.

But it is objected, that we are presuming to judge for the people of *Missouri*. Sir, I consider that *we* are interested in this question, as well as the people of Missouri. We are judging for *ourselves*, as well as for them; and we are enabled, by melancholy, dear-bought experience, to judge correctly. Gentlemen have acknowledged, that they would *advise* an exclusion of Slavery,—because they know it is an inveterate and incurable evil. But, although we know the future citizens of Missouri would be grateful for the restriction, it is not from an officious disposition to meddle with concerns which are foreign to us, that we urge it. No, Sir. If the Missourians were to be a separate people, it would be nothing to us, how many Slaves they had, or what regulations they adopted. Although we might wish them to enjoy Republican Freedom, it would be none of our business what they were, or how they were governed.

But, Mr. Chairman, they are to form a constituent part of this confederacy; they are to become members of our political Family. They are to be co-partners in our great National Firm: and are not *we* interested in the character and condition of those who propose to join us? Have *we* no right to judge of the fitness of those who wish to participate in our affairs? We have embarked in the business of Free Government. We have recognized the sublime doctrines of the *Rights of Man*, in our own States, as far as existing circumstances would permit: And do we not owe it to consistency—to our high character, and lofty pretensions—nay, to our welfare and safety—to carry this recognition of sound principles into all the new Governments erected under our authority, and which are to join us in the magnificent scheme? Do not the wise and the virtuous—the friends of Freedom and of Mankind, throughout the world—anxiously expect it at our hands? Shall we blast the hopes of those Philanthropists, who regard our country as the great Asylum—the last and only refuge of Liberty, and rational Government? Forbid it, Heaven! We are solemnly bound—not only to secure *our own* welfare, but—to provide, as far as we can, for that of *our Posterity*. When we know that the welfare of our descendants in Missouri, as well as in the United States generally, requires the restriction of Slavery,—how can we reconcile it to our duty, to permit the unnecessary introduction and diffusion of an evil, which we are sure will be the Scourge of countless generations?

But, say gentlemen, the people *now in Missouri* may not choose to exclude Slavery,—and they have a right to judge for themselves, in this matter. And pray, Sir, have not *this Congress* a right, also, to judge for themselves, whether it will be for the good of the Union, to admit new members who hold mankind as Slaves? If the people of this nation—or a great majority of them—believe, as I have no doubt they do, that it would be pernicious and dangerous to add new States of this description to the Union,—have they not a right, and a discretionary power, to exclude such States? If they have *not*, then they are in a most deplorable condition. They are then deprived of the right of *self-preservation*—a right inherent in all bodies. Sir, we have the right of self-preservation: We have the right to judge of the means of our safety: and it is our solemn duty to exercise it,—and to guard against evil, whenever it is in our power to do so. It is our duty to



take care that the Republic receive no detriment: and believing that it would be highly detrimental to this Union, and destructive of the first principles of our Government, to sanction the creation of new members with a power to establish Human Slavery where it is not *absolutely necessary*, I feel bound to oppose it. I should deem it a dereliction of duty, on my part, to connive at such an evil, for which I could not hope to be pardoned—either here, or hereafter.

I am perfectly satisfied that the clause of the Constitution which says, “new States *may* be admitted by the Congress into this Union” gives us the right to judge whether they *ought* to be admitted. We must exercise our discretion, and ascertain to our satisfaction, whether such “new States” are of a character to increase the strength and promote the welfare of this Union,—or whether they may not endanger our safety and happiness: for I contend we have a right to consult our safety, and to pursue our own happiness. The Declaration of Independence is surely correct when it asserts *this* right, notwithstanding some of its doctrines have been ridiculed and denied on this floor, (a) as they once were—and probably yet are—in the British Parliament. Sir, suppose the *Island of Cuba* should become an independent State, and should apply for admission into this Union, with all her Slaves and foreign habits; are we bound to admit her? (b) No one will pretend that we are. We should judge for ourselves, whether it would be for our good to receive her; and I, for one, should very much doubt it, under *any Treaty stipulation*; for I hold the good old Republican doctrines relative to the treaty-making power. And yet we *might* admit her,—because Congress *may* admit new States. Sir, I have not the slightest doubt on the subject of our discretionary powers.

The sparse population now in *Missouri*, may not yet perceive the evils of *Slavery*, and may, therefore, be willing to indulge in the dangerous gratifications which it affords, until it is *too late*. So it was in *South Carolina*, and *Georgia*. Those States wished for more

---

(a) Mr. *Randolph*, on this occasion, indulged in the most pungent ridicule of the Declaration of Independence, and pronounced its doctrine of Equal Rights to be an absurd “fanfaronade of metaphysical abstractions.”

(b) This *supposed* case, of *Cuba*, was adduced under the idea of its being one of extreme improbability; and yet the *Slave Power* has already grown so rampant, and grasping, as to avow its desire, and design, of annexing that Island—with all its hateful Institutions, and pestilent population—to our glorious Republic!!

*Slaves.* They insisted on the privilege (which, unhappily for themselves and the whole nation, was conceded to them,) of importing that description of persons for *twenty years* after the adoption of the Federal Constitution. But, Mr. Chairman, what do they say *now*? Do they not see their error? Nay—do they not *feel* it, and deplore it? And are we *never* to profit by woful experience? Are we to go on—wilfully and perversely blindfold—in this fatal career—until Slavery shall be extended over three-fourths of the Republics in this Confederacy? I hope not. I pray to God that we may have the virtue and the firmness to restrain its progress, before we are irretrievably lost in the dreadful abyss.

Some of the learned gentlemen of the bar, who oppose this amendment, have exercised their ingenuity in subtle distinctions and technical rules of deduction, borrowed from their own profession. They were, no doubt, very applicable to the subject; and, as far as I understood them, I listened with pleasure,—I hope with profit. They also borrowed some of their illustrations from *my* profession; and there I think I understood them better. But, Mr. Chairman, I could by no means assent to their correctness, when they came within my province. I trust they were more correct while on their own grounds. Gentlemen compared the evil of *Slavery* to a malignant poison; and they called upon us to *dilute* it, by diffusion, in order to render it more tolerable. Sir, it is a malignant poison: or rather, I would say, it is *a malignant disease in the body politic*, whose deleterious ravages are extended with all the certainty and inveteracy of specific contagion. It is more loathsome than the small-pox itself; and its desolating influence ought, by all means, to be confined within the smallest possible limits. Would you diffuse *contagion* in a community, by way of relief? Would you disseminate small-pox, with a view to dilute its malignity, or to mitigate its effects? No, sir! That would be quackery without a parallel in the darkest ages of the profession. Sir, the immortal *Ordinance* of 1787, respecting the Territories north-west of the Ohio, was the grand JENNERIAN DISCOVERY in relation to the malady of *Slavery* in our country; and I trust we shall continue to avail ourselves of the blessing. The Congress of '87 introduced a sort of *political vaccination* into the Constitutions of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, which effectually secured those States from the evil; and I am also for extending the same salutary process to our infant sister,

*Missouri.* (a) And why? Is it to injure her? Is it to mutilate or disfigure her? No, Sir! it is to secure her health, and to preserve her beauty. Mr. Chairman, should you deem these observations to savor unduly of *the shop*, I must plead, in mitigation of your censure, the *precedent* set by the gentlemen of the *green satchel*.

Much has been said, Mr. Chairman, on both sides, about *religion*—as connected with this question. I shall not adduce religious arguments in aid of my opinions,—because I am well aware that the sacred name of religion has been too often improperly used for political purposes. I have, indeed, heard the benevolent principles of Christianity urged, with unanswerable force, in my estimation, against the further extension of this crying enormity: and yet I have also recently seen, with feelings which I shall not attempt to describe, the holy Scriptures cited as authority in favor of the practice of holding mankind as *Slaves*! But I am not disposed to mingle politics with religion. I am for keeping Church and State separate, on all occasions. I cannot, however, help noticing a remark of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. *Pinckney*). I understood him to say, that Slavery could not be inconsistent with religion, because the Deity permits a large portion of the human race to be held in bondage. I am sure the gentleman did not reflect on the extent to which such an argument would go, or he would not have advanced it. If that doctrine were correct, it would go to sanction every evil that is permitted to exist in society; and we should have little reason to smile, or be surprised, at the quaint determination of the Liberty-loving fathers and founders of New England,—who, we are told, resolved that they would be governed by the laws of God until they could enact others better suited to their condition. But, Sir, I must beg leave to say, that the religion which sanctifies the un-

---

(a) The sad consequences of neglecting to *vaccinate Missouri with the Ordinance of '87*, are now but too painfully apparent to all the world. Some ignorant, fool-hardy people contended, at the time, that she was too far North to be in any danger of taking the infection (just as they say now of her neighbor *Kansas*,)—and the wily Slave Power pressed the idea upon the credulous, in order to screen her from that prophylactic operation. But *now*, our offended senses inform us—even in the distance—how frightful are the scars, and how repulsive the odor, of that hideous and persistent calamity. Instead of proudly taking her position, like a pure and wholesome member of the family, along side of her noble sisters north of the Ohio,—she has sunk into a breeder of African Slaves, and a harbinger of “Border Ruffians”—reeking with the contagion of human misery and inhuman vices,—a fit subject for a moral quarantine ground, or a political Lazaretto.



necessary existence of *Slavery*, is *not* the religion which we profess, in *Pennsylvania*.

It has been said, Mr. Chairman, in opposition to this amendment, that *all* the citizens of the United States have a *right* in the Territory west of the Mississippi,—inasmuch as it was purchased with their money ; that therefore Congress cannot prevent citizens from removing thither with their Slaves and other property. But it is admitted that the people of Missouri may, themselves, exclude Slavery. Now, if it be a right which belongs to a citizen of the United States, as such, to remove there with every description of property, how comes it that his slaves may be thus excluded? Can sixty thousand people, by forming a State Government in one of your Territories, abridge the rights of citizens of the United States? When the public lands are thrown into the market, can these Missourians exclude all purchasers who wish to come there with their Slaves? It would seem that they can: and this, to my mind, conclusively shows that the right to carry Slaves into the new States is not a right of an United States citizen, as such. But again: it is generally conceded, that Congress may prohibit Slavery in a *Territory*; and yet, if holding and carrying Slaves were one of the rights of a citizen, as aforesaid, such prohibition would seem to be a more direct infringement of that right,—because the Territory is the *common property* of the people of the United States. My inference therefore is, that the right to carry Slaves into a new State or Territory, is not a *federal* right. I consider the right—if it may be so called—of holding mankind as Slaves, to be a *local* one, derived from those State Institutions where Slavery is already permitted.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot but view this ardent desire to introduce Slavery into Missouri, as somewhat analogous to the mania for Banking, which lately prevailed to such an unfortunate degree, in some of the States. A number of speculators were so infatuated with the prospect of gain by banking, that no argument could prevail with them to pause, or to calculate the dangers of the scheme. They persisted in the delusion until they had well nigh ruined the country,—and entailed upon it a vitiated currency, which can only be eradicated by a long period of suffering and privation. So will it be—but with consequences a thousand fold more aggravated—if Slavery be permitted in Missouri. The people of that State, or their posterity, will find, when it is too late, that by yielding to the seductions of a fallacious temporary interest, there will be entailed

upon them a perpetual curse,—an evil without a remedy ; and, what is more to the purpose of the present argument, an evil which will not merely affect themselves, but the whole Union. It will impair the strength and existing relations of the Union : and, therefore, Pennsylvania is deeply interested in preventing such an evil. Sir, Pennsylvania has a deep interest in the perpetuity of this Union. Her locality—her territory, stretching from the Delaware to the Ohio, and partaking partly of the character of an Atlantic, and partly of that of a Western State ; her habits and her attachments, *all* afford a strong pledge of her devotion to the Union ; and she cannot fail to be sensibly alive to every measure calculated to affect the bonds of our Confederacy. She regards the unnecessary extension of Slavery in the new States, as a measure of that description, as a most pernicious and dangerous measure. It is, in her estimation, subversive of the true principles of the Constitution,—incompatible with the high character of our Government, and repugnant to every dictate of sound policy. Nor can these views be interpreted to the disparagement of Pennsylvania. Are they not consistent with the eternal and immutable laws of Truth and Justice ? Do they not accord with the established character of Pennsylvania ? What is her character ? Gentlemen have taken occasion to eulogize their respective States, with great justice and eloquence ; and I can see no reason why I may not attempt, in my humble style, to tell the simple, honest truth of mine. Is she aspiring, or ambitious ? Does she assume more than becomes her, as a member of this Union ? The honorable Speaker has told you—and told you truly—that she is “unassuming.” Is she not mild, and just, and humane, in her policy ? Consult her Institutions. Is she not Republican ? Yes, Sir ! She presents to you, in her sons, a phalanx of Republicans, whose firmness and inflexible devotion to the true principles of Liberty, may challenge comparison with those of any of her sisters. Is she hostile to her sisters of the South ? *Hostile*, Sir ! On the contrary, she entertains the warmest affection for them. She rejoices in their prosperity, and sympathizes with their adversity. When calamities overtake them, she feels, and she acts, as becomes her,—as becomes a true and virtuous member of this political family. If proof were demanded, I need only refer you to her proceedings at this moment, in relation to a recent and dreadful calamity in the South, (the fire at Savannah). Sir, they are worthy of her : and I take pleasure in adding, that in the district from which I have the honor to come,

every township in the respectable County where I reside, has a committee now employed in procuring relief for the sufferers. Mr. Chairman, I mention not these things vauntingly. I would disdain to do so. It would be offensive to the generous spirits engaged in the laudable work. I notice them solely to show that Pennsylvania is anything but hostile,—that she possesses and cherishes the kindest feelings toward the *South*. Is she hostile to Southern politics? Let the unostentatious annals of her political career furnish the answer. No, Sir. It has been her pride to act in concert with the Republicans of the Southern States. Her sons have marched with them, shoulder to shoulder, in the various struggles for political rights, and national honor; and when some of her temporarily misguided sisters have been vexed at her undeviating course, they have peevishly exclaimed—“Pennsylvania is partial to Virginia: She is devoted to the interests of the South!” Sir, those idle reproaches moved her not. She regarded them as the ebullitions of vexation and disappointment. Her object was the establishment of those great political principles, in the administration of our Government, which has made it the envy and admiration of the world. In every national contest for principles, or for safety, her aid has been unceasing,—her support invariable; and amid all the difficulties which the Government has found, from foreign foes, or wayward domestic factions, she has been uniformly known as “faithful Pennsylvania.” Away, then, with every insinuation that Pennsylvania may, or can be cajoled, or influenced on this question, by the spirit which erst displayed itself at *Hartford*,---or any other unhallowed spirit. Sir, any imputation of the sort---from any quarter whatever---is as groundless as it is illiberal, and she repels it with scorn. She acts from the noblest motives that can animate the human breast,---and from a clear and thorough conviction that the adoption of the proposition before you is essential to the welfare, the honor, and the safety of this Republic. The unanimous voice of her Legislative Councils, on this subject, attests her deep sense of its importance; and I trust her Representatives here will respond with fidelity to her wishes.

---

*Washington City, February 23, 1820.*

The contest on the *Missouri* question has at length assumed a somewhat different shape: Or rather, the debate in Committee of the whole, on the motion to restrict Slavery, has been superseded by



the return of the Bill from the Senate, for the admission of *Maine*, with the Missouri Bill tacked to it,—and a sort of *Compromise* annexed, relative to Slavery in the remaining *Territories*. The Senators, in their wisdom have discovered that their *Constitutional Scruples* do not extend *North* of the parallel of 36 degrees and 30 minutes! *Provided always*, that Slavery be permitted in *Missouri*!! This Bill was returned to the House on Friday last; and, according to the Rules, it took precedence of the order of the day, on Saturday morning. It was immediately moved, by Mr. *Taylor*, that the House *disagree* to the amendments of the Senate. A motion which superseded this, was made to commit the Bill and amendments to a Committee of the whole House; which was negatived by a large majority. A member (*Simkins*, of S. Carolina) then rose, and earnestly deprecated the taking of the question, to disagree, immediately,—as he declared he had not had time to *examine* the subject sufficiently! He therefore moved to postpone it until Tuesday; and the House could not decorously refuse a request of that sort—when a member had *courage* enough to make it; although it was so notoriously familiar to the rest of the body. Such manoeuvres always enable a minority to procure *delay*, in a deliberative assembly. Considerable warmth was manifested, by several members, relative to the conduct of the Senate, in coupling the two subjects of *Maine* and *Missouri*: so much so, that the Speaker had to interfere, in order to preserve that comity of style, which is due from one branch toward the other, when alluded to in debate. The fact is, a majority of the House had *thoughts*, on the occasion, which it would not have been exactly *in order* to have expressed! Yesterday, the question came up again,—when Mr. *Randolph* got the floor, and occupied the chief part of the day in a curious, desultory speech, full of anecdote and humor, and altogether characteristic of that singular genius. (a) After he had concluded, there was a strong indication of impatience for the question; but old Mr. *Rhea*, of Tennessee, rose, and said, gentlemen need'nt call out "*question*,"—for he was determined to make a speech. There then began to be a very rapid and general vacation of seats. It was growing late; and—

---

(a) Mr. R. made himself very merry over the Senate's idea of limiting the *sin of Slavery* to the latitude of 36 degrees 30 minutes. He said a conscientious man would be much embarrassed, in locating himself near the prescribed boundary; for, if he was a Slaveholder, he could not ascertain whether he was a *Sinner*, or not, without the aid of a Hadley's Quadrant, and a clear sky!

as *Goldsmith* said of *Burke*—while Mr. *Rhea* thought of *convincing*, the House thought of *dining*. After one or two unsuccessful motions to adjourn, it was finally carried, before the old gentlemen got through with his discourse. The debate will be resumed to-day.

POST-SCRIPT.

*Wednesday Evening, Feb. 23.*

The question was this afternoon taken, in the House of Representatives, on the motion to *disagree* to the amendments of the Senate, to the *Maine* Bill,—and carried by a majority of 21 votes. The responsibility of this extraordinary measure will now be very fairly and completely thrown upon that body: and it remains to be seen whether they can—in the face of this nation—adhere to the course which they have thought proper to take.

*Additional P. S.*

*February 25.*

At the conclusion of the *forty first Speech* on the *Missouri Bill*, the question was this day taken, in Committee of the Whole, on Mr. *Taylor's* amendment, to *restrict Slavery* in the new State; and it was carried by a majority of 19 votes. What the majority may be, when it comes before the House, is uncertain,—probably not quite so great.

---

*Washington City, March 1, 1820.*

It is hoped that the “long agony” (of *debate*, at least) respecting the *Missouri* question, in the House of Representatives, is almost over. On Monday, the House sat from 11 o'clock in the morning until nearly 10 o'clock at night,—engaged the whole time in the most ardent discussion: and yesterday morning, the contest was renewed with fresh vigor, and continued until after 8 o'clock in the evening,—when the Bill, containing the restriction on *Slavery*, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading by a majority of *nine* votes. Whether the battle is to be fought over again to-day, on the passage of the Bill, is uncertain: but one might hope that *Spring* would be permitted to open upon the labors of the House with a more agreeable aspect. The debate on the *Missouri Bill* commenced on Tuesday, the 25th of January; it has occupied the entire attention of the House ever since; and to-day, the first of March, the question will be put—Shall the Bill pass? If this does not prove that Congress is a *deliberative* body, it will certainly prove that sufficient *time* is taken for deliberation.

The Hall has a very fine appearance when lighted up, at night. It appears like a splendid Theatre. \* \* \* The galle-

ries were crowded with auditors; and it was a most interesting spectacle, to see a small majority of the Representatives of a great nation, at a late hour in the night, contending with a powerful and vehement opposition, and steadily persevering in support of the national character—the rights of the human race—and the prosperity and happiness of unborn millions. Should it be the unfortunate lot of the Missourians, and the other citizens who are to inhabit the regions of the West, to be afflicted with the curse of *Slavery*,—they will at least have the consolation to know that a most determined stand was taken, by a large portion of Congress, to avert the evil. Should even a *Compromise* take place,—or any other measure be adopted, which may finally defeat the noble views of the steadfast friends of restriction,—history will still have to record the fact—to the honor of human nature—that there were many who adhered with an unshaken, and *unshakeable* fidelity, to their magnanimous purpose,—in the face of the most tempestuous menaces, and in opposition to the most eloquent and impassioned declamation. The vaulted dome re-echoed with threats of blood and carnage—disunion and civil war—and all the terrifying figures which heated imaginations could conjure up. But the firm and the faithful calmly pursued their course,—resolved upon discharging the solemn duties committed to them, and leaving the event to Him who controls the elements, and overrules the fury of even the proudest among the lords of creation. These threats of *disunion*—so abhorrent to every patriotic mind, and so at variance with the parting injunctions of the Father of our country—have become disgracefully common, in latter times: but it is to be hoped that the good sense of the nation will frown the preachers of such detestable heresy into merited contempt. It is the glory of the *Middle States*—among which *Pennsylvania* stands pre-eminent—to have eschewed this desperate folly; and to have controlled, and moderated, the madness of the extremities. During the times of embargo, and war, misguided factionists in the *East* cried out for *disunion*, and encouraged treason; but the influence of the Middle States arrested their phrenzied career. Now, the same odious clamor is raised by sundry Hotspurs of the *South*; and here, again, we may hope that the steady patriotism of the Middle States will exert its wonted salutary influence, and sustain the harmony and integrity of our *Union*, until the sober sense of the people in all parts of the coun-



try shall silence the ravings of infuriated zealots. (a) The honest and virtuous mass of the American people cannot be yet prepared for the mischiefs which are so intemperately threatened by ambitious individuals. Just and legitimate acts of Government never yet produced commotions among an enlightened and virtuous people; and Americans cannot be already so deteriorated, as to consider a restriction on the further extension of Human Slavery, an act either of injustice, or impolicy. It would be a libel on the sons of the men of '76, to entertain such an idea for a single moment.

POSTSCRIPT.

March 3.

The die is cast. *Missouri* is admitted to the privilege of forming a Constitution and State Government, *without the restriction of Slavery!* Senate rejected the restrictive clause, in the *Missouri* bill, and sent it back with an additional section, to exclude Slavery in the *Territories* north of 36 degrees and 30 minutes.

The Committee of *Conference* (b) recommended to the House to adopt these amendments; on which condition Senate had agreed to

(a) The former preachers of *disunion*, down *East*, pretty soon discovered—when they came to reflect, and *calculate*—that their prosperity as a people would not probably be much enhanced by abandoning our glorious old Confederacy: whereupon they concluded to abide by the “sober *second* thought.”

So, on the other hand, every intelligent person is now aware, that the noisy vapoing of the *Slave Power*, down *South*, is all a *Sham*,—intended merely to scare the servile remnants of obsolete Parties, and squabbling factions, in the *North*. The *Slave Power* is an *Unit*, and tolerates no dissenting factions in its *own dominions*: but it encourages feuds and divisions, elsewhere, the better to manage them. Yet while that cunning *Oligarchy* thus threatens, it knows full well—none can know it better,—that the “*peculiar Institution*” would not be safe for one hour, under the influences resulting from a dissolution of the Union. Catch *that* wily Power voluntarily encountering the perils of *disunion*! Why *should* it—so long as it can wield at pleasure the physical energies of the *Free States*? which it does—has done—and will be apt to do, until Brain ceases to govern Muscle, or common sense shall become epidemic in the Masses.

(b) The Committee of Managers, on the part of the *House*, were Messrs. *Holmes*, of *Maine*, *Taylor*, of *N. Y.*, *Lowndes*, of *S. Carolina*, *Parker*, of *Mass.* and *Kinsey*, of *New Jersey*.

This Committee was not exactly a fair one,—although four of them were from *Free States*. *Holmes* was rather pro-slavery, and moreover directly interested in getting *Maine* admitted; *Kinsey* was a *Dough-face*,—and went over, when the time came. *Lowndes*, of course, went with the Senate: and *Taylor* and *Parker* were left in the minority.

The Managers for the *Senate* were Messrs. *Thomas*, of *Illinois*, [the mover of the *Compromise*], *Pinkney* of *Md.*, and *Barbour*, of *Va.* *Six*, of the *eight*, were

admit *Maine* into the Union. *Then* came the trying moment. The most pathetic appeals were made to members; the horrors of disunion were depicted on one hand,---and the blessings of harmony portrayed on the other. Some wavering friends of restriction disappeared from the house, and three or four went over to the other side; and when the question was taken, there was a majority of *three* for acceding to the amendments of Senate! I am proud, however, to say, that notwithstanding the threats, and the appeals to the fears and the feelings,---honest Pennsylvania---“*faithful Pennsylvania*” stood firm as a rock. (a) *Two* of her members had been

under the control of the *Slave Power*! It is a curious, and significant circumstance, in this struggle between the two branches of Congress, that when the House refused to concur with the Compromise amendment of the Senate, that body proceeded, as usual, to *insist*; but the wily Slaveholders, on this occasion, thought to steal a march on the Free States, by insisting on *that portion only*, which admitted Missouri *without restriction*,---and thus quietly aiming to *evade* the restriction of Slavery in the other Territories, North of *thirty-six degrees, thirty minutes*! Accordingly, on a motion of a *Virginia* Senator, it was “*Resolved*, That the Senate *insist* on their amendment, containing provisions for the admission of Missouri into the Union.” But Senator *Roberts*, of Pennsylvania, was too wide awake for that dodge to succeed,---and promptly followed up the Virginia resolution, with the following:

“*Resolved*, That the Senate *insist* on their other amendment, prohibiting the further introduction of Slavery into the Territories of the United States.”

A decent regard for appearances, required the adoption of the *second* member of the Compromise,---when the first portion had just been carried: and so the Senate *insisted* on the whole amendment,---and the House succumbed. The famous *Compromise* was thus *forced* on the North, by the *Slave interest*,---aided by a few *dough-faced* adherents; to be wantonly *violated*---under the plea of “*Squatter Sovereignty*”---when it suited the base purposes of intriguing Politicians.

(a) Of the 23 Representatives of Pennsylvania, of that day, the following named 21 resisted the *extension of Slavery into Missouri*---and *all Free Territory*---on any pretext, or *Compromise*, whatsoever, viz:

Boden,	Gross,	Maclay,	Patterson,
Darlington,	<i>Hemphill</i> ,	Marchand,	Philson,
Denison,	Hibshman,	R. Moore,	Rogers,
<i>Edwards</i> ,	Hiestor,	S. Moore,	<i>Sergeant</i> ,
<i>Forrest</i> ,	Hostetter,	Murray,	Tarr,

Wallace.

Of the above, 17. were old-fashioned Democrats; and 4 (whose names are in *italics*) were called *Federalists*. Parties had not, *then*, been so drilled, in the old “*Keystone State*,” as to make fealty to the *Slave Power* a test of *Democracy*. In truth, *Slavery*, at that time, was scarcely regarded---even at the *South*---as being *essentially* a “*Democratic Institution*.”

opposed to the restriction *from the beginning* (viz.: Messrs. Baldwin and Fullerton—though the *latter* voted for it, until the pinch came); but the remainder were not to be moved, even in *that* trying moment,—for it was an awful crisis. Every thing horrible was threatened, with the most determined aspect of menace. One member *fainted* twice, while pleading for the *Compromise*. The Bills [for Maine, and Missouri] were signed this afternoon, and carried to the President, for his signature. Thus has Congress *possibly* averted evils, threatened by distempered men of the Slaveholding States, and *certainly*, in my opinion, humbled the proud character of our Republic, in the eyes of the world.

---

WASHINGTON CITY, April 5, 1820.

The House of Representatives has been occupied, for two days, in discussing Mr. Clay's Resolutions, relative to the late Treaty with Spain. It is not calculated, I believe, that any positive measure will grow out of them—even if adopted; nor is it known that any good can result from the discussion of them. They seem to be a sort of negative censure of the Administration, for yielding up the disputed province of *Texas*, in the late negociation; and it is very evident that the supporters of the Resolutions are anxious to defeat the ratification of the Treaty, and to *re-assert* our claim to the country west of the Sabine. It is also sufficiently apparent from what has transpired, that a number of those who desire Texas, want it for the express purpose of erecting Slaveholding States out of its Territories. It was said, in debate, that great injustice had been done to the South: that the largest portion of Louisiana had been given up to the non-slaveholding States; and the most valuable portion of the remainder had been ceded to a foreign power! After such an avowal as this, it is idle and ridiculous for those gentlemen to talk about the evils of *slavery*,—and about colonization of the negroes—and to express a wish that the Slaves could all be removed from our country. IT IS NO SUCH THING. Notwithstanding the empty verbiage which we have heard, *I venture to predict, that the settled policy of the slaveholding States will be, to prevent the admission of any new non-slaveholding State into this Union, unless a slaveholding State shall be admitted, to balance it.* Without any pretensions to the gift of Prophecy, I fearlessly appeal to the future history of this Government, for the confirmation of my prediction. So much for *my opinion* of the *sincerity* with which Slaveholding



gentlemen declaim against that abominable stain upon our country. Instead of viewing Slavery as a curse (as they profess---or rather have professed), and rejoicing in the erection of new Republics which shall be secured from that curse,---they regard the multiplication of non-slaveholding States as an *evil*---as an act of injustice to themselves,---unless Slavery shall at the same time be extended to an equal degree! (a) Was ever such mockery of principle exhibited under the sun? And this, too, in a young country---enjoying a free Republican Government! Freedom, it seems, must not be permitted to extend farther, unless Slavery go with it, *pari passu*! And why? Because, forsooth, it would be an act of injustice to those who pretend to consider Slavery as a great curse! Being disgusted even to loathing, by these developments of ulterior views,---I, for one, have no great appetite for additional Territories. I can scarcely wish to see new free States erected under our banners, if they must necessarily give birth to a corresponding number of slaveholding States,---and thus make additional blots on our already checquered escutcheon. If these are to be the terms, I think we have States enough; and I must distrust the policy of those who are so anxious to give us the province of Texas:

-----“Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes.”

I fear the Grecians, and the gifts they bring. (b)

---

(a) So emphatically has this view been confirmed, that we have all seen a servile Administration---after a noisy bravado about “*fifty-four forty, or fight,*”---quietly send a Pro-Slavery Agent to *negotiate away* the disputed Territory, lest it should be formed into one or more *Free States*! Next, we find it going valiantly to war with poor, unfortunate *Mexico*---on a false pretence, and without authority---in order to procure *new fields* for the “*peculiar Institution.*” Does any body suppose that the *Slave Power* of the country would have sustained the Mexican war, for a single moment---if it had been *likely* to acquire Territory for *Freedom*? No one, I think, has yet been seen, outside of an asylum for the feeble-minded, who was *quite that far gone* in credulous simplicity.

(b) Here end the contemporary *Remarks* (as published in the *American Republican*) on the memorable effort, in 1820, to prohibit the establishment of the “*peculiar Institution*” in the young State of *Missouri*. That effort---as all the world is aware---was unsuccessful. The wily *Slave Power*---by scaring, or wheedling, a few Northern “*Dough-faces*” (as they were scornfully dubbed, by *John Randolph*, after they had been thus made use of),---and by urging a specious *Compromise*, which has since turned out to be a shameless *fraud*---triumphed by a small majority; and, most likely, has indelibly fixed the dark destiny of the future dwellers in *Missouri*. That insane *rote* has already caused about a hundred thousand worthless Slaves to exclude twice that num-

ber of sturdy freemen from the State ; and yet its evil consequences are only beginning to be developed. To adopt the prophetic strain of *Cherry-Chase*—

The child may rue that is unborn,  
The voting of that day.

Encouraged by the result of the Missouri controversy, and the subserviency of Northern demagogues in permitting the revocation of the Compromise of 1820 (compared to which, the cruel revocation of the edict of *Nantes* was a small affair),—the attempt is now being made, by that same power, to desecrate the free soil and fair regions of the west, by introducing and multiplying therein a degraded population—each of which is equivalent only to *three-fifths of a man!* and those substitutes for manhood are to extend the basis of a reckless *political power* which already controls the Government of this “model Republic ! !”

Assuredly, the noble States and glorious Institutions of this great Empire can neither prosper, nor be secure, on such a basis. Free States can only be built up, and maintained, where every male inhabitant is *five-fifths of a man*—a genuine, intelligent Human Integer ; and not a miserable down-trodden *fraction* of the species. It has been clearly ascertained—and we shall do well to recognize the fact,—that neither chattel *Slaves*, nor brutified *Polygamists*, can constitute a State, worthy of this Confederacy. Such States must consist of “high-minded men”—

———“Men who their duties know,  
But know their Rights, and knowing, dare maintain.”

FINIS.







































































